

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached six sheets of drawings contain replacement FIGS. 1-7 as required. Applicant notes that drawing FIGS. 1-7 were filed with the original application as indicated by the attached copy of the stamped-receipt post card.

Attachment: Replacement sheets (copies of previously-submitted)  
Copy of stamped-receipt post card

**REMARKS**

Claims 28-52 were pending. Claims 34-37 and 40-51 have been canceled. Claims 28, 38, 39, and 52 have been amended. Claims 28-33, 38-39, and 52 are pending.

Applicant notes a typographical error introduced by the Office to patent application publication US 2004/0062100. More specifically, on page 2, in paragraph [0026], at line 9, the term "dock" should read --clock--. The term appears correctly in the application as filed on page 6, line 3.

The Office Action requires new corrected drawings. The attached six sheets of drawings contain replacement FIGS. 1-7 as required. Applicant notes that identical drawing FIGS. 1-7 were submitted as formal drawings with the original application as evidenced by the attached copy of the stamped-receipt post card.

The Office Action objects to the disclosure based on an informality. The specification has been corrected as required. Other minor typographical errors also have been addressed.

Claims 38-39 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 based on double patenting of the same invention as that of claims 5-6 and 23 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,504,750 to Baker. Reconsideration of this rejection respectfully is requested. Claims 38, 39, and 52 do not claim the same invention as that of claims 5-6 and 23 of Baker. Claim 38, for example, recites a step of "selecting one of a plurality of resistances" that is not recited in claim 5. Claim 52 recites that "the controlled voltage supply is operatively connected to a selected memory cell of a memory device," which structure is not recited in claim 23 of Baker. Claims 38-39 and 52 are not of the same scope as claims 5-6 and 23 of Baker.

Claims 28-33 stand rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-6 and 23-24 of Baker. A terminal disclaimer overcoming the rejection accompanies this submission.

Claims 28-33, 38-39, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, based on indefiniteness. Claims 28, 38, and 52 have been amended to address these concerns, and are submitted as particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter of the invention.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant

Attachments: Replacement drawings FIGS. 1-7 (six sheets)

Terminal disclaimer

Stamped-receipt post card